

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the Specification at p. 7, ll. 17-19; p. 8, ll. 8-9; and Figs. 4A and 4B.

The amendment does not present new matter or raise new issues. In view of the preceding claim amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application.

***The Claimed Invention***

In brief, the claims cover an exercise equipment comprising a coupling mechanism configured to movably couple a support portion to a base. In order to use the equipment, a user sits on a saddle connected to the support portion, and the coupling mechanism moves the support portion. In particular, the coupling mechanism moves the support portion in "forward and backward directions with accompanied vertical displacements of said support portion, such that the load resulting from the user's own weight and acting on the leg fitted in said recess increases as said support portion moves in the forward direction." (Amended claims 1, 11).

The Specification describes the back and forth motion as follows:

[A]ccording to this coupling mechanism 4, a bottom end of the post 21 works as fulcrum, and the post can be moved **back and forth** and around in an oscillating manner.

\* \* \*

This motor 9 enables an oscillating motion of the saddle 22 relative to the post 21 in the forward and backward direction.

(Specification, p. 7, ll. 17-19; p. 8, ll. 8-9; *also see* Figs. 4A and 4B).

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103***

**In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,480 to Halsted in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0163231 to Hoshino.**

The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, it was asserted in the Office Action that the definition of “oscillation” includes movement between two points, which covers the up and down movement of **Halsted**. (Office Action, p. 6-7). Further, it was asserted that up and down movement is within the flexion and extension direction of a knee joint. (Office Action, p. 7).

However, **Halsted** and **Hoshino** fail to render the claimed invention obvious because the references do not disclose a support portion movable in **forward and backward directions**, as well as up and down directions. In the claimed invention, the ability to move forward and backward results in the following exercise: “the load resulting from the user’s own weight and acting on the leg fitted in said recess increases as said support portion moves in the forward direction.” (Amended Claims 1, 11).

In light of the fact that **Halsted** and **Hoshino** do not disclose a support portion movable in forward and backward directions, the cited prior art fail to render obvious the invention recited in amended claims 1-6 and 11. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halsted, in view of Hoshino, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,908 to Lu.**

Lu fails to disclose a support portion movable in forward and backward directions. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Halsted, Hoshino, and Lu fail to render obvious the invention recited in dependent claim 7. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halsted, in view of Hoshino, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,357,825 to Bavaresco.**

Bavaresco fails to disclose a support portion movable in a back and forth direction. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Halsted, Hoshino, and Bavaresco fail to render obvious the invention recited in dependent claims 8 and 10. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halsted, in view of Hoshino, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 608,682 to Jamieson.**

Jamieson fails to disclose a support portion movable in a back and forth direction. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Halsted, Hoshino, and Jamieson fail to render obvious the invention recited in dependent claims 8 and 9. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above amendment, the applicants believe the pending application  
to be in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William L. Brooks

Registration No.: 34,129

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE  
LLP

P.O. Box 55874, Boston, MA 02205

(202) 478-7370

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant